

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2019, AT 6:30 P.M. IN THE MEN'S LOUNGE OF THE CLARKDALE POLICE ANNEX, 49 N. NINTH STREET, CLARKDALE, AZ.**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

Chairperson	Laura Jones	Present
Vice Chairperson	Robyn Prud'homme-Bauer	Excused
Board Members	Michael Pierce	Present
	Michael Lindner	Present
	Mike Garvey	Present

**STAFF:**

Project Manager	Mike Gray
Planning Manager	Beth Escobar

A **Regular Meeting** of the Design Review Board of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 6:30 p.m. in the Men's Lounge of the Clarkdale Police Annex, 49 N. Ninth Street, Clarkdale, AZ.

1. **AGENDA ITEM: CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
2. **AGENDA ITEM: ROLL CALL:** Project Manager Gray called roll.
3. **AGENDA ITEM: PUBLIC COMMENT:**
  - a. The public is invited to provide comments at this time on items that are not on this agenda. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision on a later agenda, as required by the Arizona Open Meeting Law. Each speaker is asked to limit comments to **FIVE minutes**.

No public present.

4. **AGENDA ITEM: MINUTES:**

- a. Consideration of the **Regular Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2019.**  
**Board Member Garvey made a motion to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2019. Board Member Pierce seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

Chair Jones	Aye
Vice Chair Prud'homme-Bauer	Excused
Board Member Pierce	Aye
Board Member Garvey	Aye
Board Member Lindner	Aye

**5. AGENDA ITEM: REPORTS: Chairperson and Member Report:**

No reports.

**6. AGENDA ITEM: NEW BUSINESS:**

- a. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** Design review of DRB application 092356 for a portable sign proposed in front of Su Casa Mexican Restaurant, 1000 Main Street, APN 400-03-189.

Presented by Project Manager, Mike Gray:

**Summary:** The proposed sign is a portable sandwich board type sign. The application complies with all criteria for design review.

**Possible Actions**

Motion to approve/disapprove the proposed portable sign for DRB application 092356.

**DISCUSSION:**

Board Member Michael Pierce asked if the sign area includes the frame or if it's just for the text area of the sign. Gray replied the total square footage of the sign includes the frame.

**Board Action: Board Member Lindner moved to approve the application and the motion was seconded by Board Member Garvey. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Jones	Aye
Vice Chair Prud'homme-Bauer	Excused
Board Member Pierce	Aye
Board Member Garvey	Aye
Board Member Lindner	Aye

- b. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Site plan and design review of proposed Arizona Public Service (APS) Clarkdale Substation located at 1591 State Route 89A in Clarkdale. The 2.29 acre property is Assessor's Parcel Number 406-27-053B and the zoning is Single Family Residential (R1).
- Staff Report
  - Questions to Staff
  - Comments from the applicant
  - Open Public Hearing
  - Close Public Hearing

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

- c. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION:** Site plan and design review of proposed Arizona Public Service (APS) Clarkdale Substation located at 1591 State Route 89A in Clarkdale. The 2.29 acre property is Assessor's Parcel Number 406-27-053B and the zoning is Single Family Residential (R1).

Planning Manager Escobar prefaced the hearing with an acknowledgement that she had originally misinterpreted the Zoning Code, and that in fact, electric substations are not allowed in any of the Town of Clarkdale's Zoning Districts. For this reason, the applicant is required to go through the process of applying for a Zone Change and a Conditional Use Permit in order to move forward. Escobar further clarified the Design Review Board's role as being limited to site plan and design review, and not including zoning or use.

CDD Project Manager Gray presented the application with a Power Point presentation.

**Board comments during the presentation:**

Chair Laura Jones

- On two occasions, Chair Jones reminds members of the public their questions will be answered during the public comment period.
- Requests a description of the contents of the proposed enclosure.
- Chair Jones addresses concerns about zoning and states this is why the applicant will need to go before Planning Commission in order to move forward. She encourages everyone present to attend the Zoning hearing on May 21. Jones points out the previously established point that this facility serves a different purpose from the battery storage facility that exploded in Peoria, but offers Mr. Weed the opportunity to expound on safety features of the facility.
- Expresses three concerns with the proposed joint-access to the property: 1. this is a large expanse of hard-scape, 2. aesthetics and 3. the removal of existing vegetation.
- States more information is needed to make a decision.

Board Member Michael Lindner

- Asks about a scenario in which DRB approves the application, but another site is mandated through zoning process. In that case, would the application come back through design and site plan review, or is this DRB's only opportunity to provide input?
- Asks how this site was chosen.
- Asks if there might be a reasonable location some distance away.
- Asks if the facility needs to be as large as proposed.
- Requests rendered elevations of the site and full size samples of the proposed block.

Board Member Michael Pierce

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

- Requests confirmation that the block walls conform to required setbacks.
- Requests the clarification on the height of the proposed walls.
- Asks if design review will evaluate anything beyond what was presented – specifically, the transformers etc.
- Asks the applicant about any additional poles and wires not mentioned with the application.
- Responds to question that it is possible to bury 12KV lines, but 69KV lines are very expensive to place underground.
- Expresses concern that 89A enters Clarkdale from higher terrain, and that approaching traffic will be looking down into the enclosure. This is not an ideal greeting especially since it's located right next to our Clarkdale sign.
- He points out the need to limit the scope of discussion to this particular site, and not make assumptions about future results of zoning and use hearings.

Board Member Mike Garvey

- Asks for a physical description of the site.
- Expresses concern that the contents of the enclosure will be visible from Panorama Drive.
- Requests information on the security product at the top of the wall.
- Comments on poor aesthetics and the message it would seem to send to passers-by.
- Agrees with Chair Jones' comment that more information is needed.
- Suggests putting a limitation on additional power poles.

**Staff and applicant responses during the presentation:**

Planning Manager Beth Escobar

- States Community Development Department (CDD) will work with the applicant as the process moves forward.
- States the new landscape code calls for trees of a 3' minimum height.
- States the contents of the enclosure were not brought forward due to the understanding the equipment will be hidden from view.
- Reminds the Board that they have the authority to stipulate design elements – for instance, the burial of new lines – staff would write those recommendations into the stipulations.
- Informs the board they have the option to table the discussion until either June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, or until a decision has been reached by Planning Commission and/or Council.
- Further suggests staff request elevations and renderings of the applicant to offer a better idea of what the finished facility will look like.

Project Manager Mike Gray

- Confirms the enclosure complies with required setbacks.
- Explains that with varied terrain, it is necessary to stagger a block wall to maintain a uniform height with topography.

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

- Offers a description of the proposed walls and rolling gates, then requests the applicant further describe the contents of the enclosure.
- States if a new site is selected or mandated through the zoning process, a new application is required and a new design and site plan review process is opened.

**Applicant Ryan Weed responding to Board comments and concerns,**

- The facility is an open-air facility with 10-11 foot tall walls surrounding electrical equipment.
- He expounds with advantages of the topography and the ability to maintain exterior elevations very close to natural grade while screening the interior of the site.
- He describes the grading of the site and explains retaining walls may have an interior height of up to 18' while the exterior of the enclosure will only have 10' walls.
- He states the electrical equipment is visible above the walls at the Cornville Substation, but that at this site, the walls will conceal the equipment, and that "passers-by (and) the residents that live in the area will only see the wall."
- He points out the presence of a 20' wide gas easement along SR 89A that may limit the use of some plantings in that immediate area.
- Explains the need for additional poles and wires that were not included with the application. He states the wire run would be straight from the existing 69KV to the substation, eliminating potentially miles of additional poles and wires. He points out the existing run on an overhead view of the area.
- States that although wires will still be visible, the predominant view from 89A will be the wall and that the electrical equipment will be concealed by the terrain and the grading process proposed. He states it is possible to bury 12KV lines, but 69KV lines are very expensive to place underground.
- Offers further description to the situation of electrical equipment within the enclosure – which is far enough back that, viewed from a human perspective at ground level, the equipment should be fully concealed.
- Describes the wall-topper product named in the staff report, and the need to protect the substation from various types of intrusions.
- Offers the applicant's view of site-specific advantages and their efforts to propose a compatible and relatively unobtrusive facility with regard to neighboring uses – specifically the future fire station and the existing water tanks.
- The site was selected with several things in mind including the location of the future fire station and its seemingly compatible use and the proximity of the existing 69 KV lines. He points out the fact that lines are more problematic than a substation because it would impact more people with miles and miles of poles and lines.
- He states codes, required spacing of equipment and circulation all factor into the size of the site.
- Initially, there will be one transformer and eventually two as demand dictates, but planning for expansion will eliminate future processes down the road with potentially more facilities.

## ***Design Review Board***

***May 1, 2019***

- Emphasizes applicant's willingness to collaborate with the community and offers the possibility of matching aesthetics of VVFD Station 36 to make the two look like a unified campus.

### **Public Comment: Resident comments and concerns:**

Mr. Michael Whitaker pleads for denial of the application, citing aesthetic concerns ("looks like a prison"), a perceived lack of need for the facility and an extended period of time for vegetation to conceal the facility.

Mrs. Marlene Whitaker is concerned with the appearance and dimensions of the proposed wall.

Mr. Randy Skeirik talks about the impact the existing water tanks have had on the view shed and asks why the foothills must be burdened with more infrastructure. He feels strongly that his property value will be negatively impacted by both the diminished view as well as electro-magnetic radiation (EMFs) associated with electric substations. He further stresses the fact that electric substations are specifically excluded from all residential zoning. Mr. Skeirik comments that it would be nice if the applicant would move their existing lines away from the area. He states his disagreement with that analysis of the visibility of electrical equipment over the wall. Mr. Skeirik further states area residents already have "their share" of infrastructure, and urges consideration for the neighborhood.

Mr. Phil Terbell questions the need for a new substation.

Mrs. Lynda Steele recommends:

1. The wall should be staggered
2. The wall should be built to 12' high, instead of 10'
3. She states concerns about a recent explosion at a facility in Peoria AZ and asks if there will be hazardous materials on the site.
4. She asks if there will be a porta-potty stationed outside the facility.
5. She asks the applicant "Absolutely nothing will show over the top, correct? You guarantee us that."
6. She further requests as much wiring as possible go below grade and asks how many more poles should be expected in the area.

Mr. Mark Steele expresses concern about a recent explosion in Peoria, AZ. He also asks about further information on footings for the wall.

Mr. Rick Saggio is concerned about impact to views from Panorama Way. He also cites impact to home values and he asserts his belief that electro-magnetic frequencies (EMFs) are a significant concern. He states his perception that the community is unaware of the project and that those people with whom he spoke are unhappy about it.

Mrs. Jeanine Saggio asserts nobody wants a substation in their back yard. She states she "looked online and it decreases values of homes from 16 to 30 percent". She feels APS can afford to do

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

this somewhere else and echoes sentiments from other residents that DRB “Please not let this happen”.

**Applicant, responding to resident concerns:**

- The wall is necessary to protect the equipment, from people who might try to gain unauthorized access, adding that Homeland Security issues come into consideration. He points out the efforts made to make the wall blend in with the surroundings, and that the applicant is willing to take community input to enhance the aesthetics of the design. He makes the example of a contoured wall APS agreed to install in Wickenburg, which mimics a neighboring mountain profile.
- He states the exterior dimensions of the enclosure will be 350' x 350' and this is necessary for the equipment and for circulation of maintenance vehicles.
- He answers concerns about equipment visible over the wall by describing a combination of measures that will be taken to get the pad well below the existing topography and the block wall.
- He states efforts have already been made to vary the height and linearity of the wall by incorporating curves.
- Various comments lead Mr. Weed to acknowledge a voiced desire for a higher wall and he states this is a request that they can easily accommodate.
- In response to request for Mrs. Steele's request for a guarantee that “Absolutely nothing will show over the top...” Mr. Weed states “That's a guarantee that I will make to you.” After some unintelligible comments from the public, he acknowledges this guarantee will be dependent on one's vantage point.
- He states the necessity for a porta-potty during construction but that it would not be a permanent part of the facility.
- With regard to explosive batteries Mr. Weed states there will be batteries inside the facility just enough to power the enclosed equipment, and that by comparison, the facility with recent trouble in Peoria had enough batteries to power the surrounding area in the event of a power outage. He assures this facility serves a different purpose and will not be used in that manner.
- Mr. Weed refers to the overhead site plan view and points out likely locations or future poles and describes the Cor-Ten (rusty metal) material.
- He clarifies some misunderstanding on interior wall height vs exterior wall height.
- He states footings for these walls typically average 5-6 feet wide.

**Staff, responding to resident concerns:**

- Planning Manager Escobar states stipulations can be added to the effect that no equipment will be visible above the wall from certain aspects. Ms. Escobar follows up safety questions by commenting that Verde Valley Fire District is a reviewing agency for this facility and that if it moves forward, they will identify safety issues and require those issues to be addressed.

***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

- Mr. Gray responds to a request by Chair Jones to answer the need for the substation in the area. He states the answer is beyond his expertise but that the application states the intention of the site is to increase reliability, citing the frequency of power outages.

**Board Action: Board Member Garvey moved to table the discussion until after the rezoning and Conditional Use Permit process. The motion was seconded by Board Member Michael Pierce. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Jones	Aye
Vice Chair Prud'homme-Bauer	Excused
Board Member Pierce	Aye
Board Member Garvey	Aye
Board Member Lindner	Aye

- After the vote, Ms. Escobar announces that those residents who can't make it to the meeting may either e-mail her or bring their comments to Community Development and that those comments will be read into the record.
- Chair Jones confirms that this meeting is being recorded.
- Mr. Saggio expresses his intention to start a petition.
- Chair Jones encourages people to attend the future meetings.

- 7. PRESENTATION:** A PowerPoint presentation by Michael Lindner, of the Clarkdale Historical Society and Museum, outlining the museum's recently adopted strategic plan.

There were no questions, but a good-natured exchange of comments about the closing photograph featuring George Benatz and an old Packard in front of the Clark Mansion.

**8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

For the June 5, Regular meeting, DRB #091907 for a portable sign for Hensley Artglass, to be placed in front of the Clarkdale Classic Station at 924 Main Street.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Board Member Lindner made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Board Member Garvey and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:11 PM.

Chair Jones	Aye
Vice Chair Prud'homme-Bauer	Excused
Board Member Pierce	Aye
Board Member Garvey	Aye
Board Member Lindner	Aye



***Design Review Board***  
***May 1, 2019***

**APPROVED BY:**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robyn Prud'Homme-Bauer", written over a horizontal line.

**Interim Chairperson**

Robyn Prud'Homme-Bauer

**SUBMITTED BY:**

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mike Gray", written over a horizontal line.

**Project Manager**

Mike Gray

